Reconstructing open quantum system dynamics with limited control

Simon Milz, Felix A. Pollock, and Kavan Modi

School of Physics and Astronomy, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia.

October 10, 2016

arXiv:1610.02152v1 [quant-ph] 7 Oct 2016

The dynamics of an open quantum system can be fully described and tomographically reconstructed if the experimenter has complete control over the system of interest. Most real-world experiments do not fulfill this assumption, and the amount of control is restricted by the experimental set-up. That is, the set of performable manipulations of the system is limited. For instance, imagine a set-up where unitary operations are easy to make, but only one measurement at the end of the experiment is allowed. In this paper, we provide a general reconstruction scheme that yields operationally well-defined dynamics for any conceivable kind of experimental situation. If one additional operation can be performed, these 'restricted' dynamics allow for the construction of witnesses for initial correlations and the presence of memory effects. We demonstrate the applicability of our framework for the the two important cases where the set of performable operations comprises only unitary operations or projective measurement, respectively, and show that it provides a powerful tool for the description of quantum control experiments.

1 Introduction

Traditionally, the dynamics of open quantum systems, *i.e.*, systems that are coupled to an environment, are described by channels that map initial states of the system of interest to final states[1]. This description is well-defined and experimentally reconstructible for the case of Markovian dynamics [1–4], but loses its physical meaning for more general cases [5, 6]. To overcome this problem, the so-called superchannel formalism [7] was proposed, which is an operational framework for the description of general quantum mechanical processes. In this framework, open quantum system dynamics are modeled only in terms of parameters that are in principle controllable/measurable by the experimenter, namely the settings of the experimental set-up at the beginning of the experiment and the final state of the system after the experiment has concluded. Consequently, the superchannel is a linear and completely positive (CP) map that unambiguously maps each possible manipulation of the system – or, more generally, each input that is controllable by the experimenter – to a final output state. Note that the complete positivity of the superchannel helps to resolve paradoxical violations of fundamental physical and information-theoretic bounds [8–10] by constructing bounds that properly account for the initial correlations between the system and its environment [11].

Recently, the superchannel approach has been extended to processes where the system can be manipulated at several fixed times, leading to a more general map called the process tensor [12] (correspondingly, a superchannel is a one-step process tensor). Once reconstructed experimentally, it allows for the prediction of the final system state for any sequence of intermediate manipulations. Given the process tensor, it is possible to determine whether locally detectable system-environment correlations were present in the initial state before preparation [7]. Fur-

Simon Milz: simon.milz@monash.edu

Felix A. Pollock: felix.pollock@monash.edu

Kavan Modi: kavan.modi@monash.edu

[1] Unless otherwise specified, when we refer to a system's state, we mean its density operator.

thermore, it allows for an unambiguous investigation of the presence of memory effects, *i.e.*, non-Markovianity, in the underlying process [12]. Note that the notion of the process tensor is closely related, mathematically, to the concepts of supermaps [13], quantum combs [14], causal modelling [15, 16], causal boxes [17] and the operator tensor formulation of quantum theory [18, 19].

In order to reconstruct the process tensor experimentally, it is necessary to be able to perform local operations that constitute a basis of all local physical operations, *i.e.*, a basis of the set of CP maps. The requirement of full local control is not met in most real-world experiments. Generally, experimenters are only interested in the effects of a restricted set of manipulations, or the set of available manipulations is fundamentally limited by the experimental set-up. Well-known examples are ubiquitous in the field of quantum control [20], where, *e.g.*, shaped laser pulses are used to control the dynamics of molecules [21] or partial measurements are employed to steer the system of interest to a desired final state [22]. Other prominent examples include experimental set-ups in quantum optics, where beam splitters and phase shifters can be used to implement arbitrary (single-photon) unitary gates [23], but no non-unitary operations.

All of the experimental procedures listed above can readily and meaningfully be cast in the language of the process tensor formalism. However, neither the influence of laser pulses, nor partial measurements, nor unitary operations, when taken as distinct sets, constitute a basis of the set of all possible manipulations of the system of interest. To make matters worse, these operations do not even constitute a convex space, let alone a linear vector space. It is, therefore, unclear if a meaningful process tensor can be experimentally reconstructed from this limited set of accessible manipulations, where by meaningful we mean that it maps every realizable input manipulation to the correct corresponding output state.

For example, it is not obvious how to construct a map that yields the correct output states for any unitary operation by measuring the output states corresponding to a finite set of unitary operations alone. A similar question regarding maps for projective operations on qubits has been examined in [24], while the construction of quantum channels based on incomplete information has been investigated in Refs. [25, 26]. Finally, it is of interest if, and to what extent, assertions about correlations and memory effects can be made based on such a 'restricted' process tensor.

In this paper, we modify the general construction of the process tensor to account for the restrictions imposed by specific experimental set-ups. The resulting restricted process tensor is a linear map that can always be reconstructed, and is a full dynamical description of the respective experiment. Unlike the full process tensor, it is generally not a completely positive map. In particular, we analyze the realm of validity of restricted process tensors and construct operationally meaningful witnesses for initial system-environment correlations and the non-Markovianity of processes. Somewhat surprisingly, such witnesses can always be constructed, regardless of the limitations set by the experimental situation. The applicability of these constructions is shown in detail for two extremal and experimentally relevant cases: where the available operations are the set of unitary operations and the set of projective measurements, respectively. Note that the availability of both unitary and projective operations together would amount to a full basis of operations. Finally, we apply the restricted process tensor to the field of quantum control of open systems [20], particularly to dynamical decoupling [27], and show that it is the right tool to capture the influence of local Hamiltonians on the dynamics of an open system when no microscopic model can be assumed.

2 Background

2.1 Tomographic reconstruction

The most general, operationally meaningful description of any quantum process is a map that maps experimentally controllable inputs to final output states that can be determined by means of quantum state tomography (QST) [1, 2, 28] (see Fig. 1).

Depending on the experimental set-up in question, the inputs can be, *e.g.*, initial system states, initial preparations, sequences of local operations, or both initial states *and* sequences of local operations. For each of these cases, the map describing the process can experimentally be re-



Figure 1: *Schematic representation of an experiment.* Experimentally controllable inputs are mapped to measurable outputs. We consider the case where the outputs are states, *i.e.*, they can be determined by QST. The space of inputs depends on the map to be reconstructed, and hence on the relevant physical situation. Generally, both the inputs and the outputs can be either states, (sequences of) CP maps or maps on CP maps [13, 14].

constructed by measuring the final states corresponding to a complete basis of the inputs[2].

It is instructive, as a first step, to recall the well-known case of quantum process tomography (see, *e.g.*, Ref. [2]), where initial states are considered to be the inputs of the process. An adequate dynamical description in this situation is a channel Λ that maps initial system states to final system states. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$ be the space of bounded operators acting on the $d_\mathcal{S}$-dimensional system of interest and let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})) \cong \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$ be the space of bounded maps acting on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$. The experimental reconstruction of the channel $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$ can be achieved by determining the output states $\eta^{(i)} = \Lambda\left(\rho^{(i)}\right)$ for a set of $d_\mathcal{S}^2$ input states $\left\{\rho^{(i)}\right\}$ that constitute a basis of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$. Let the action of Λ in a given basis be defined by $[\Lambda(\rho)]_{rs} = \sum_{r's'}^{d_\mathcal{S}} \Lambda_{rr';ss'}\rho_{r's'}$. Note that the action is not a matrix multiplication (see Ref. [29] and App. A). The linear map Λ is then given by

$$\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{d_\mathcal{S}^2} \eta^{(i)} \otimes \omega^{(i)\mathrm{T}}, \qquad (1)$$
$$\text{where} \quad \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho^{(j)}\omega^{(k)}\right) = \delta_{jk}, \quad \forall j,k.$$

The set $\left\{\omega^{(i)}\right\}$ is called the dual set to $\left\{\rho^{(i)}\right\}$. It can be constructed for any set of linearly independent matrices $\left\{\rho^{(i)}\right\}$ [30]. The channel Λ reconstructed via Eq. (1) yields the correct output state for each input $\rho^{(i)}$, and hence, by linearity, for any state $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$; it is a valid description of a process whenever the preparation of system states is independent of the environment.

Generally, an experimenter does not have direct control over initial states, but rather over the operations $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$ used to prepare the system. Accordingly, the map $\mathcal{M}$ that describes the process, maps each preparation $\mathcal{A}$ to a final state $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}) = \eta_\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$ [7]. Microscopically, this can be understood as follows: Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$ be the state space of the system of interest and let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{E})$ be the state space of an environment, that can neither be controlled nor manipulated. A general experiment consists of three steps: an unknown total state $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{E})$ is subjected to a local preparation, *i.e.*, $\rho'_{\mathcal{SE}} = (\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{E})[\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}]$, where $\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{E}$ is the identity operator acting on the environment and $\mathcal{A}$ is a completely positive map[3], which we will assume, henceforth, can be implemented on a time scale much smaller than typical time scales of the system dynamics. Subsequently, the prepared total state undergoes a unitary evolution $\mathcal{U}$ and, finally, the output state of the system after the evolution $\eta_\mathcal{S} = \mathrm{Tr}_\mathcal{E}[\mathcal{U}(\rho'_{\mathcal{SE}})]$ is determined via quantum state tomography. The map $\mathcal{M}$ – the so-called superchannel – describing this experiment, is a completely positive and linear map $\mathcal{M}$ that unambiguously maps any initial preparation $\mathcal{A}$ to its corresponding final state, *i.e.*, $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathrm{Tr}_\mathcal{E}\{\mathcal{U}[(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{E})\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}]\}$. Its experimental reconstruction has been demonstrated recently in Ref. [32]. Note that $\mathcal{M}$ is linear and CP independent of the (generally unknown) initial state $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}$, which is considered part of the dynamics and not as an input that $\mathcal{M}$ acts on [7].

In clear analogy to the aforementioned case, the map $\mathcal{M}$ can be experimentally reconstructed by measuring the output states $\left\{\eta_\mathcal{S}^{(i)}\right\}$ corresponding to a basis $\left\{D^{(i)}\right\}_{i=1}^{d_\mathcal{S}^4}$ of the space of ini-

[2]Note that far more general inputs and outputs can be considered [13, 14], but for the experimental set-ups we aim to describe, the aforementioned list is sufficient.

[3]A completely positive map $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S}))$ corresponds to a positive matrix $M_\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})^{\otimes 2}$ and *vice versa* ([31], Chap. 10). For simplicity of notation we will generally not distinguish between $\mathcal{A}$ and its representation in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})^{\otimes 2}$.



Figure 2: *Depiction of a multi-step process.* The local operations $\mathcal{A}_k$ act at times t_k. In between, the dynamics is governed by the total unitaries $\mathcal{U}_{k+1:k}$. The final state is determined by QST at the time t_N. Note that the superchannel is merely a one-step process tensor.

tial preparations, *i.e.*, a basis of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})\otimes\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$:

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_\mathcal{S}^4} \eta_\mathcal{S}^{(i)} \otimes \Delta^{(i)\mathrm{T}}, \tag{2}$$

with $\eta_\mathcal{S}^{(i)} = \mathrm{Tr}_\mathcal{E}\left\{\mathcal{U}\left[\left(D^{(i)}\otimes\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{E}\right)\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}\right]\right\}$ and the duality relation $\mathrm{Tr}\left(D^{(i)}\Delta^{(j)}\right) = \delta_{ij}$. The set $\left\{\Delta^{(i)}\right\}$ is the dual set to the basis $\left\{D^{(i)}\right\}$ [30]. The action of $\mathcal{M}$ on an arbitrary local operation $\mathcal{A}$ is given by (see App. A):

$$\left[\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})\right]_{rs} = \sum_{r'r''s's''}^{d_\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{M}_{rr'r'';ss's''}\mathcal{A}_{r'r'';s's''}\,. \tag{3}$$

The superchannel description applies to experimental procedures that include a single preparation of the system of interest. Its natural extension, the process tensor, acts on an arbitrary number of manipulations at fixed time steps, with free unitary evolutions $\mathcal{U}_{n+1:n}$ in between, and was developed in Ref. [12] (see Fig. 2). For N time steps, the process-tensor $\mathcal{T}^{N:0}$ is a linear CP map that returns a final system state $\eta_\mathcal{S}$ that depends on the N operations that were performed at the fixed time steps t_k, *i.e.*, $\eta_\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T}^{N:0}(\mathbf{A}_{N-1:0})$, where $\mathbf{A}_{N-1:0} := \{\mathcal{A}_{N-1};\cdots;\mathcal{A}_1;\mathcal{A}_0\}$ is the sequence of (possibly correlated) local operations performed at the time steps t_k. $\mathcal{T}^{N:0}$ can be reconstructed via

$$\mathcal{T}^{N:0} = \sum_{\vec{i}} \eta_\mathcal{S}^{(\vec{i})} \otimes \Delta^{(\vec{i})\mathrm{T}}, \tag{4}$$

where $\eta_\mathcal{S}^{(\vec{i})}$ is the output state for the choice of N preparations $D^{(\vec{i})} = \bigotimes_{k=0}^{N-1} D^{(i_k)}$, respectively, and $\Delta^{(\vec{i})\mathrm{T}} = \bigotimes_{k=0}^{N-1}\Delta^{(i_k)\mathrm{T}}$. $\mathcal{T}^{N:0}$ can meaningfully be applied to any admissible sequence of local operations $\mathbf{A}_{N-1:0} \in \left[\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})\otimes\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})\right]^{\otimes N}$.

By construction, it allows for the prediction of the final state given the intermediate local operations that were performed. It is therefore ideally suited to describe quantum control experiments. Additionally, it contains all locally accessible information about the underlying process, in particular information about initial correlations and the (non-)Markovianity of the dynamics [7, 12]. Note that the above construction generalizes to any kind of conceivable inputs and outputs of an experiment; by determining the outputs for a basis of the inputs, the map describing the experiment can be reconstructed.

2.2 (Initial) correlations

In recent years, much effort has gone into developing techniques which detect initial system-environment correlations. This intensive research has lead to a large number of so-called witnesses [33–35] that have little predictive power and almost every case has to be treated in isolation [36, 37]. In Refs. [7, 12], it was shown that a full superchannel/process tensor contains all the information about possible initial system-environment correlations that can be detected by means of local operations. This is most easily discussed for the superchannel case – a generalization to the process tensor follows straightforwardly.

Any initial state (before preparation) can be written as

$$\rho_{\mathcal{SE}} = \rho_\mathcal{S}\otimes\rho_\mathcal{E} + \chi_{\mathcal{SE}}, \tag{5}$$

where $\rho_\mathcal{S} = \mathrm{Tr}_\mathcal{E}[\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}]$, $\rho_\mathcal{E} = \mathrm{Tr}_\mathcal{S}[\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}]$ and $\chi_{\mathcal{SE}}$ contains all initial correlations between the system of interest and its environment. The superchannel $\mathcal{M}$ allows for the derivation of the correlation-memory matrix $\mathcal{K}$ that describes the influence of $\chi_{\mathcal{SE}}$ on the dynamics of the system:

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathrm{Tr}_\mathcal{E}\left\{\mathcal{U}\left[\left(\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{I}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{SE}}\right]\right\}. \tag{6}$$

Note that $\mathcal{K}\neq\mathbf{0}$ implies that the initial state $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}$ was correlated. On the other hand, $\mathcal{K} = 0$ merely implies that if initial correlations were present, the total unitary $\mathcal{U}$ does not allow for their detection via local operations.

For an N-step process, the process tensor $\mathcal{T}^{N:0}$ contains all multi-time correlations. That is, $\mathcal{T}^{N:0}$ allows to deduce the individual influence of system-environment correlations at time steps

t_j on the dynamics, as well as the combined influence of correlations at several time-steps. Consequently, it enables the analysis of memory effects of the underlying process.

2.3 Markovianity of processes

If an experiment consists of more than one time-step, assertions about the (non-)Markovianity of the underlying process can be made. To this end, following [12], we introduce the notion of a causal break. A causal break is a local operation that consists of a projective measurement of the system followed by an independent preparation of a known state. It is represented by a CP map $\mathcal{A} = P^{(i)} \otimes \Pi^{(j)\mathrm{T}}$, where $\Pi^{(j)}$ is the pure state the system is projected onto during the measurement and $P^{(i)}$ is the freshly prepared state. The action of a causal break on a total state $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}$ is given by $\left(P^{(i)} \otimes \Pi^{(j)\mathrm{T}} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{E}}\right)[\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}] = P^{(i)} \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}\left(\Pi^{(j)}\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}\right)$. A causal break therefore decouples the system from its environment and prepares it in a known state.

A process is said to be Markovian if the final state of the system at the time step following a causal break only depends on the freshly prepared state $P^{(i)}$, and not on $\Pi^{(j)}$ or any local operation or preparation conducted at preceding time steps. Otherwise, it is said to be non-Markovian, since the only way past actions could influence the future evolution is through some kind of memory. Expressed in the process tensor formalism, the condition for Markovianity translates to:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{T}^{k:0}(P^{(a)}_{k-1}|\Pi^{(b)\mathrm{T}}_{k-1}; \mathbf{A}_{k-2:0}) \\ &\quad\propto\ \mathcal{T}^{k:0}(P^{(a)}_{k-1}|\Pi^{(b')\mathrm{T}}_{k-1}; \mathbf{A'}_{k-2:0}) \qquad (7)\end{aligned}$$

$\forall a, b, b', \mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}, \mathbf{A'}_{N-2:0}, k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, where the proportionality appears instead of an equality, as the operations $P^{(i)}_{N-1} \otimes \Pi^{(j)\mathrm{T}}_{N-1}$ are not necessarily trace preserving. Since $\mathcal{T}^{N:0}$ is a linear operator, Eq. (7) allows the process to be checked for Markovianity with a finite number of experiments [12].

For the full experimental reconstruction of a process tensor, it is necessary for the experimenter to have access to a basis of the space of operations on the system of interest, *i.e.*, the operations that can be performed must span the full operator space $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})$. The same holds for the investigation of system-environment correlations and the (non-)Markovianity of a process. In many current experiments, this is simply not possible. We will now explore what can be learned when the available operations are limited.

3 Restricted process Tensors

The vast majority of real-world experiments are necessarily, or by design, constrained in the amount of control that the experimenter can exert on the system of interest. For example, as already mentioned, both optical experiments and those concerned with quantum control only allow for the application of unitary operations. Given that the unitary operations – and generally any limited set of operations – do not form a linear vector space, it is *a priori* unclear how a meaningful description of an experiment can be reconstructed by measuring the output states corresponding to a finite number of inputs. The same holds true for the analysis of initial correlations and memory effects; as a restricted set of control operations does not necessarily allow one to infer information about the state of the system (this is particularly true for the case of unitary operations), a direct investigation is prevented by the limitations of the experimental set-up. In this chapter, we show how to reconstruct 'restricted' process tensors and witnesses for correlations and memory effects for arbitrary experimental scenarios. These general considerations are concretized in Sec. 4 for the important case of control being limited to unitary operations and projective measurements, respectively.

3.1 Restricted tomographic reconstruction

Let the set $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})$ of operations that can be performed by the experimenter be a subset of all possible quantum operations and $W = \mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ the vector space spanned by this set. We call $\mathcal{F}$ restricted if $W \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})$. For example, $\mathcal{F}$ could be the set of unitary operations acting on the system, or a finite control algebra [27]. The experimental reconstruction of a process tensor based on a restricted set of available local operations follows directly from Eq. (4), *i.e.*, it can be reconstructed by measuring the output states for a basis of the space the set of available inputs spans.

Let d_w be the dimension of W. By definition,

there exists a set $\{f^{(i)}\}_{i=0}^{d_w-1} \subset \mathcal{F}$ that constitutes a basis of W. Following Eq. (4), the N-step process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}$ for the restricted set of preparations $\mathcal{F}$ can be reconstructed by measuring the output states $\zeta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\vec{i})}$ corresponding to each of the d_w^N possible choices $f^{(\vec{i})} = \bigotimes_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{(i_k)}$ of local operations at the time steps t_k. It is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0} = \sum_{\vec{i}} \zeta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\vec{i})} \otimes \Theta^{(\vec{i})\mathrm{T}}, \tag{8}$$

where $\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Theta^{(i)} f^{(j)}\right) = \delta_{ij}$ and $\Theta^{(\vec{i})\mathrm{T}}$ denotes the sequence of operations $\bigotimes_{k=0}^{N-1} \Theta^{(i_k)\mathrm{T}}$. Any admissible sequence of local operations $\mathbf{A}_{N-1:0} \in W^{\otimes N}$ can be written as $\mathbf{A}_{N-1:0} = \sum_{\vec{i}} a_{\vec{i}} f^{(\vec{i})}$. Hence, by construction, the action of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}$ is well defined on $W^{\otimes N}$ and yields the correct output states:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}(\mathbf{A}_{N-1:0}) &= \sum_{\vec{i},\vec{j}} a_{\vec{i}} (\zeta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\vec{j})} \otimes \Theta^{(\vec{j})\mathrm{T}})[f^{(\vec{i})}] \\ &= \sum_{\vec{i}} a_{\vec{i}} \zeta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\vec{i})}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

It is important to note that, in general, W contains a larger set of CP maps than $\mathcal{F}$. For example, the space spanned by the set of unitary maps contains all unital maps (see Sec. 4.1 below). The total vector space of sequences of local operations at N time steps can be written as $[\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})]^{\otimes N} = \left[W \oplus W^{\perp}\right]^{\otimes N}$, where $W^{\perp}$ is the orthogonal complement of W in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})$. The full process tensor can then be expressed as

$$\mathcal{T}^{N:0} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0} + \sum_{\vec{\alpha}} \xi_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\vec{\alpha})} \otimes \Gamma^{(\vec{\alpha})\mathrm{T}}, \tag{10}$$

where $\{\Gamma^{(m)}\}_{m=0}^{d_{\mathcal{S}}^4-d_w-1}$ constitutes a dual set to a basis $\{g^{(m)}\}_{m=0}^{d_{\mathcal{S}}^4-d_w-1}$ of $W^{\perp}$ and $\xi_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\vec{\alpha})}$ is the output state corresponding to the sequence of local operations $\bigotimes_{m=0}^{d_{\mathcal{S}}^4-d_w-1} g^{(\alpha_m)}$. It is easy to see that for any $\mathbf{A'}_{N-1:0} \in \left(W^{\perp}\right)^{\otimes N}$ one obtains $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}(\mathbf{A'}_{N-1:0}) = \mathbf{0}$. Consequently, the action of $\mathcal{T}^{N:0}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}$ coincides on $W^{\otimes N}$, but the restricted process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}$ does not allow for meaningful predictions of the output state for any sequence of preparations $\mathbf{A}_{N-1:0} \notin W^{\otimes N}$. How much $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}$ deviates from $\mathcal{T}^{k:0}$ highly depends on both the number as well as the norm of the terms in the second sum in Eq. (10). The number is given by $d_{\mathcal{S}}^4 - d_w$, while the norm critically depends on the total unitary maps $\{\mathcal{U}_{k+1:k}\}_{k=0}^{N-1}$ that govern the evolution of the total state in between the time steps t_k.

Eq. (8) establishes how a process tensor for an N-step process can be reconstructed based on a restricted set $\mathcal{F}$ of local operations; given $\mathcal{F}$, it is necessary to derive the dimension d_w of the vector space $\mathcal{F}$ spans, find a set $\{f^{(i)}\}_{i=0}^{d_w-1} \subset \mathcal{F}$ of d_w linearly independent local operations, and, subsequently, measure the output state for each of the d_w^N possible sequences of these operations. The reconstructed process tensor can then be meaningfully applied to any admissible sequence of operations $\mathbf{A}_{N-1:0} \in [\mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})]^{\otimes N}$.

3.2 Properties of restricted process tensors

By construction, both the restricted process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}$ as well as the full process tensor $\mathcal{T}^{N:0}$ are linear maps. While it is clear that the latter contains information about all intermediate process tensors $\mathcal{T}^{k:j}$ $(0 \leq j < k \leq N)$ [12], it does not immediately follow that this is the case for the restricted process tensor. This is because its limited domain in general prevents decomposition into matrix elements in the full vector space in which $\mathcal{F}$ is embedded.

Under the assumption that the experimental set-up allows one to 'do nothing' (that is, act on the system with the operator $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{S}}$) at the time steps $t_{j'}$ $(j' < j)$, the restricted process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:j}$ $(0 \leq j < N)$, which describes the dynamics from t_j to t_N, can be obtained:

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:j}(\cdot) = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}(\,\cdot\,, \underbrace{\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{S}}}_{j \text{ times}}). \tag{11}$$

Furthermore, if $\mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ also contains a set of operations $\{\mathcal{A}^{(\mu)}\}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{(\mu)}(\rho_{\mathcal{S}}) = E^{(\mu)} \rho_{\mathcal{S}} E^{(\mu)\dagger}$ and the matrices $\{\Pi^{(\mu)} = E^{(\mu)\dagger} E^{(\mu)}\}$ constitute an informationally complete (IC) POVM (see, *e.g.*, [31], chapter 10), the process tensors $\mathcal{T}^{k:j}$ (where $0 \leq j < k \leq N$) can be derived from $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}$ as well (see App. B). Note that these conditions are fulfilled for the case where the set $\mathcal{F}$ of performable operations coincides with projective measurements of the system.

In contrast to the full process tensor, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}$ is generally not a completely positive map. This

is most easily seen for the superchannel case; in order for a map to be completely positive, each trivial extension of it has to be positive, *i.e.*, map positive elements to positive elements. In our case, the positive elements (*i.e.*, the positive matrices) correspond to completely positive maps (see Fn. 3) and a superchannel $\mathcal{M}$ is CP iff any trivial extension of $\mathcal{M}$ is a positive map; *i.e.*, for any ancilla given by $\mathcal{H}_A$ and any completely positive operator $\mathcal{A}_{SA} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)^{\otimes 2} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)^{\otimes 2}$ acting on the system plus ancilla, we have

$$(\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{I}_A)[\mathcal{A}_{SA}] \geq 0, \tag{12}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_A$ is the identity map on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)^{\otimes 2}$. The trivial extension of a restricted superchannel $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{F}$ is only physically meaningful for operators $\mathcal{A}_{SA}$, whose action on the system lies in Span($\mathcal{F}$). Accordingly, the notion of complete positivity does not make sense for restricted superchannels (and analogously for process tensors), if Span($\mathcal{F}$) does not coincide with $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)^{\otimes 2}$. Note that a restricted process tensor does not even have to be positive: it is well-defined on $[\text{Span}\,(\mathcal{F})]^{\otimes N}$, *i.e.*, it maps any sequence of CP operations from this space to a positive operator, but there is no reason why this should hold true for operations that do not lie in $[\text{Span}\,(\mathcal{F})]^{\otimes N}$. However, given that the full process tensor can be written as

$$\mathcal{T}^{N:0} = \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{F}^{N:0} + \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}^\perp}^{N:0}, \tag{13}$$

(see Eq. (10)) the restricted process tensor can always be extended to a CP map by determining the output states for the remaining basis elements of the inputs.

3.3 Witnesses for correlations

Given the full superchannel $\mathcal{M}$ of a one-step process, it is possible to derive the correlation-memory matrix $\mathcal{K}$ that contains all the the information about system-environment correlations of the initial state [7]. The derivation of $\mathcal{K}$ relies implicitly on the fact that the set of local operations used for the experimental reconstruction of $\mathcal{M}$ constitutes a basis of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$. It is therefore in general not directly applicable to $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{F}$, the restricted superchannel constructed from a limited set $\mathcal{F}$ of local operations. However, with one additional local operation, meaningful statements about initial correlations can also be made on the basis of any restricted set of operations.



Figure 3: *Preparation of a product state.* Two copies of the initial state $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}$ are created and their system degrees of freedom are swapped by the operation $S_{12}^{(\mathcal{S})}$. Subsequently, the degrees of freedom of the second copy are disregarded.

Consider two copies of the initial system-environment state $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}$. Let $S_{12}^{(\mathcal{S})}$ be a swap operation between the two system parts, *i.e.*, $S_{12}^{(\mathcal{S})} |jj'\rangle = |j'j\rangle$, where $\{|j\rangle\}$ is an orthogonal basis of $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S}$. Then:

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}_2\mathcal{E}_2}\left[S_{12}^{(\mathcal{S})} \left(\rho_{\mathcal{SE}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{SE}}\right) S_{12}^{(\mathcal{S})\dagger}\right] = \rho_\mathcal{S} \otimes \rho_\mathcal{E}. \tag{14}$$

It is possible, and operationally well-defined, to create an initial product state $\rho_\mathcal{S} \otimes \rho_\mathcal{E}$ independently of the initial total state $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}$ (see Fig. 3 for a depiction of this). Let $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{F}$ denote the restricted superchannel constructed for this uncorrelated initial state. The corresponding correlation-memory matrix is given by $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{F}$. It contains all the information about correlations that can be detected by local preparations $\mathcal{A} \in \text{Span}\,(\mathcal{F})$. This means that, if $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{F} \neq 0$, there exist initial system-environment correlations; if $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{F} = 0$, no correlations that can be detected by local preparations in Span $(\mathcal{F})$ are present. Depending on the dimension of Span $(\mathcal{F})$ and the total dynamics $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ can contain the same information about the existence of initial correlations; in general, though, they will differ (see Sec. 4 for explicit examples).

In principle, the swap operation enables the construction of witnesses for correlations for any set $\mathcal{F}$ of available local operations. Being able to perform swaps at all time-steps t_k would even allow for the investigation of all possible multi-step correlations. However, not in every experimental set-up will it be possible to perform a local swap operation. If Span($\mathcal{F}$) contains operations that decouple the system from its environment, it is nonetheless possible to construct witnesses for correlations (see Sec. 4.2).

Finally, if neither the swap $S_{12}^{(\mathcal{S})}$ nor local operations that decouple the system from its envi-

ronment are available to the experimenter, then correlations and non-Markovianity may still be witnessed in a less direct sense: If the system is uncorrelated from its environment at some point, then its subsequent single-step dynamics is described by a CPTP channel, with a $d_{\mathcal{S}}^2$-dimensional input space. Therefore, if there are more than $d_{\mathcal{S}}^2$ linearly independent inputs (*i.e.*, elements of Span($\mathcal{F}$)) to the restricted process tensor which are not consistent with a single CPTP channel, there must be correlations contributing to the dynamics.

3.4 Witnesses for Non-Markovianity

For an N-step process, the full process tensor $\mathcal{T}^{N:0}$ enables the unambiguous investigation of the Markovianity of the underlying process. This is due to the fact that $\mathcal{T}^{N:0}$ allows for the prediction of the final state for any sequence of k ($k \leq N$) local operations $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0} \in [\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})]^{\otimes k}$ and hence also for any sequence $\mathbf{A}_{k-2:0}$ of $k-1$ local operations followed by a causal break. On the other hand, a restricted process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}$ can only meaningfully be applied to sequences $\mathbf{A}_{N-1:0} \in [\mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})]^{\otimes N}$. For the construction of witnesses by means of restricted process tensors, we will solely focus on causal breaks at t_{N-1}. If the set $\mathcal{F}$ is such that is allows for the derivation of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{k:0}$ the following considerations can be expanded to causal breaks at earlier time-steps in a straightforward way to construct better witnesses.

For the investigation of the Markovianity of a process by means of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}$, there are two cases that have to be distinguished. If Span($\mathcal{F}$) contains at least two different causal breaks with the same freshly prepared state, Eq. (7) can be evaluated directly: if there are two sequences $\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}, \mathbf{A'}_{N-2:0} \in [\mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})]^{\otimes N-1}$ and two causal breaks $P_{N-1}^{(a)} \otimes \Pi_{N-1}^{(b)\mathrm{T}}, P_{N-1}^{(a)} \otimes \Pi_{N-1}^{(b')\mathrm{T}} \in \mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})$, such that

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}(P_{N-1}^{(a)} | \Pi_{N-1}^{(b)\mathrm{T}}; \mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}) \not\propto \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}^{N:0}(P_{N-1}^{(a)} | \Pi_{N-1}^{(b')\mathrm{T}}; \mathbf{A'}_{N-2:0}), \quad (15)$$

the process is non-Markovian. The converse does not hold. An example of an experimental setup for which Span($\mathcal{F}$) contains causal breaks, but $\mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F}) \neq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})$ would, *e.g.*, be an experiment where the system of interest is a qubit, and the only operations that can be performed on it are measurements of the observable σ_z followed by the preparation of a fresh qubit state. The span of the corresponding set $\{\rho \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|), \rho' \otimes (|1\rangle\langle 1|)\}$ of performable operations (where ρ, ρ' are arbitrary qubit states and $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ are the eigenstates of σ_z) does not coincide with $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}})$, but contains causal breaks.

The second case that has to be investigated is that where Span($\mathcal{F}$) does not contain different causal breaks with the same freshly prepared state and a direct evaluation of Eq. (15) is not possible. A prominent example of this is the case where $\mathcal{F}$ is the set of unitary operations (see Sec. 4.1). Given that the detection of non-Markovianity hinges on the availability of causal breaks, at first sight, such a set of local operations seems to be inadequate for the investigation of the Markovianity of a process. However, as discussed above, as long as the swap $S_{12}^{(\mathcal{S})}$ can be performed between two identically prepared copies of the system, any $\mathcal{F}$ can be used for the construction of witnesses for system-environment correlations. The same holds if $S_{12}^{(\mathcal{S})}$ cannot be performed, but Span($\mathcal{F}$) contains operations that decouple the system from its environment.

Intuitively, it is clear that, if correlations can be detected via local operations, the process must be non-Markovian. This intuition can be stated formally: Let $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}(\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0})$ be the total system-environment state after the sequence of $N-1$ local operations $\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0} \in [\mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})]^{\otimes N-1}$ was performed at time steps $\{t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_{N-2}\}$. For any such sequence $\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}$, the restricted superchannel $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}}$ can be constructed. $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}}$ is the superchannel from t_{N-1} to t_N, given that the sequence of operations $\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}$ was performed at the $N-1$ previous time steps. That means, that for all $\mathcal{A}_{N-1} \in \mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})$, the final output state $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}}(\mathcal{A}_{N-1})$ is equal to $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\{\mathcal{U}_{N:N-1}[(\mathcal{A}_{N-1} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{E}})[\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}(\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0})]]\}$. If $S_{12}^{(\mathcal{S})}$ can be performed, it is also possible to construct the corresponding restricted correlation-memory matrix $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}}$. If there exists a sequence $\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0} \in [\mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})]^{\otimes N-1}$ such that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}} \neq \mathbf{0}$, the process is non-Markovian. We prove this statement in App. E. What it says is simply that, if correlations can be detected in a process, it is non-Markovian. Again, the converse statement is not true. On the one hand, a restricted set of local operations does

not necessarily allow for the detection of all locally detectable correlations. On the other hand, a process can also be non-Markovian without any system-environment correlations being present at any point in time [12]. Note that the the above is also true if the correlations were detected without the use of a swap operation, as the detection of correlations always implies the existence of a non-vanishing restricted correlation-memory.

Up to reshuffling and normalization, the full process tensor corresponds to a multipartite quantum state. In the case of Markovian dynamics, this so-called generalised CJI state only has correlations between subsystems corresponding to neighbouring preparations and subsequent measurements [12]. In the restricted case, one might be tempted to try to use a similar reshuffling and an analysis of the structure of the resulting object as a witness for non-Markovianity. However, this might lead to a false witness, as the reshuffled restricted process tensor could exhibit correlations between subsystems corresponding to non-neighbouring time-steps, even though the underlying process is Markovian. This can most easily seen by analogy: Let $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1} + \sum_i a_i\sigma_i$ and $\rho_2 = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1} + \sum_i b_i\sigma_i$ be two qubit states. The resulting product state $\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$ will generally contain terms of the form $\mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma_i$ and $\sigma_i \otimes \mathbb{1}$. If these terms are removed from $\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$, the resulting matrix will no longer be a product state (generally, it will not even be a valid quantum state anymore). Analogously, the reshuffled restricted process tensor is equal to the full reshuffled process tensor with some terms removed. This removal of terms will generally lead to correlations between non-neighbouring preparations and subsequent measurements even if none are present in the full process tensor and hence yield false witnesses.

All the constructions presented above are general and work for any set $\mathcal{F}$ of accessible local preparations. Depending on the set $\mathcal{F}$, it might be difficult to find the dimension d_w of its span and to construct/find a complete set of d_w linearly independent preparations $f^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}$. We will now consider two interesting and experimentally relevant families of accessible local operations that allow for analytical treatment.

4 Examples and applications

Two extremal cases of experimental control are the case where only unitary operations are available, and the case where only projective measurements can be performed. They are extremal in the sense that unitary operations do not allow one to infer any information about the system, while projective measurements provide direct access to information, but lead to collapse into a definite (pure) state, and destroy any correlations. As they decouple the system from its environment, projective measurements enable the construction of alternative witnesses of correlations that do not require a swap operations. Furthermore, these two sets of operations are mathematically accessible enough to derive the dimensions of their respective spans. A comparison of the the number of output states that have to be measured for the reconstruction of the corresponding restricted superchannels and process tensors can be found in Tab. 1.

Note that being able to perform both unitary operations as well as measurements is tantamount to full control. Given that unitary operations and measurements are ubiquitous in experimental set-ups, we analyze these two cases in detail.

4.1 Unitary operations

A local unitary map $\mathcal{Z}$ acting on the system part of a quantum state $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{E})$ is of the form $\mathcal{Z} \otimes \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{E}[\rho] = (Z \otimes \mathbb{1}_\mathcal{E})\rho(Z^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{1}_\mathcal{E})$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{Z} \otimes \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{E})[\rho]_{r\mu;s\nu} &= Z_{rr'}\rho_{r'\mu;s'\nu}Z^*_{ss'} \\ &= \mathcal{Z}_{rr';ss'}\rho_{r'\mu;s'\nu},\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where $Z \in \mathrm{SU}(d_\mathcal{S})$ is a unitary matrix. It is straightforward to see that, up to normalization, a unitary map corresponds to a pure, maximally entangled state $\rho_\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{S})$. Let W denote the span of the set $\mathcal{V}$ of unitary maps. Any element $\mathcal{W} \in W$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{W} = \sum_\mu b_\mu \left(\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} + \sum_{k,l=1}^{d_\mathcal{S}^2-1} c_{kl}^{(\mu)} \sigma_k \otimes \sigma_l \right), \tag{17}$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is the $d_\mathcal{S} \times d_\mathcal{S}$ identity matrix and $\{\sigma_k\}$ are the traceless generators of $\mathrm{SU}(d_\mathcal{S})$. The converse is also true; any map that can be expressed in the form of Eq. (17) lies in W [38]. Eq. (17)

implies that no causal break $P \otimes \Pi^{\mathrm{T}}$ can be expressed as a linear combination of unitary maps, since $P \otimes \Pi^{\mathrm{T}}$ always contains terms of the form $\sigma_k \otimes \mathbb{1}$ or $\mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma_k$; these terms do not appear in Eq. (17). The set of completely positive maps contained in W coincides with the set of unital maps (the set of completely positive maps that leave the completely mixed state invariant) [39].

From the fact that the operators $\{\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1}, \sigma_k \otimes \sigma_l\}_{k,l=1}^{d_S^2-1}$ are linearly independent, we deduce that W is $d_w = \left(d_S^2 - 1\right)^2 + 1$-dimensional (whereas the space of all possible local operations is d_S^4-dimensional). In the qubit case, for example, we have $d_w = 10$ and a possible basis $\left\{\mathcal{Z}^{(0)}, \mathcal{Z}^{(j,\pm)}, \mathcal{Z}^{(j+k+1,+)}\right\}$ of W that consists of unitary maps can be readily derived (see App. C; note that the maps $\{\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1}, \sigma_k \otimes \sigma_l\}$ also form a basis of W, but do not correspond to unitary maps). In the general case, it is sufficient to randomly choose a set of d_w linearly independent unitary maps for the construction of the restricted superchannel/process tensor.

A superchannel $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}$ constructed based on the set of unitary local operations can also meaningfully be applied to any unital map $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_S\right) \otimes \mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_S\right)$. This means, that, by measuring the output states for $\left(d_S^2 - 1\right)^2 + 1$ linearly independent unitary operations, the output state for any unital map can be predicted. Analogously, the restricted N-step process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}^{N:0}$ can meaningfully be applied to any sequence of operations $\mathbf{D}_{N-1:0} \in W^{\otimes N}$. The restricted correlation-memory matrix $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}}$ encapsulates all correlations that are detectable by local unital operations.

4.2 Projective operations

If the experimental set-up only allows for projective measurements of the system of interest, the set $\mathcal{P}$ of available operations coincides with rank-1 projections. The local action of a map $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{P}$ on a quantum state $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_E)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathcal{I}_E)[\rho] &= (Q \otimes \mathbb{1}_E)\rho(Q \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \\ &= Q \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_S\left(Q\rho\right), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $Q \in \mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_S\right)$ is a pure state. Note that the total state after the action of $\mathcal{Q}$ is of product form and the new system state is given by Q. Nonetheless, projections cannot be used to investigate the Markovianity of a process directly, by evaluating Eq. (7); for every freshly prepared state Q, there is always only one causal break that corresponds to a projective measurement.

Any map $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{P}$ can be written as $Q \otimes Q^{\mathrm{T}}$; therefore, any map $\mathcal{N} \in \mathrm{Span}\left(\mathcal{P}\right)$ must be of the form

$$\mathcal{N} = \sum_{\nu} b_\nu \, Q^{(\nu)} \otimes Q^{(\nu)\mathrm{T}}, \tag{19}$$

where $Q^{(\nu)} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$ are pure states and $b_\nu \in \mathbb{R}$. $\mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{P})$ is at most $\frac{1}{4}d_S^2(d_S+1)^2$ dimensional (see App. D). For the qubit case, a set $\left\{Q^{(\nu)}\right\}$ of $\frac{1}{4}d_S^2(d_S+1)^2 = 9$ pure states that correspond to linearly independent maps $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(\nu)}\}$ has been constructed in Ref. [24] (and is reproduced here in App. D).

A superchannel $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}$ constructed based on projections alone can meaningfully be applied to any CP map $\mathcal{A}$ that satisfies $\mathrm{Tr}_{S_1}(\mathcal{A})) = (\mathrm{Tr}_{S_2}(\mathcal{A}))^{\mathrm{T}}$, where Tr_{S_1} and Tr_{S_2} denote the trace with respect to the first and second subsystem in Eq. (19), respectively. Analogously, a process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}^{(N:0)}$ can be applied to any physically admissible sequence of operations in $[\mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{P})]^{\otimes N}$.

Given that projective measurements decouple the system from its environment and prepare it in a known state, they enable an alternative construction of witnesses for correlations. The restricted process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}^{N:0}$ allows for the derivation of any intermediary superchannel $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}|k+1:k}^{\mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0}}$ between neighbouring time-steps t_k and t_{k+1}, given the sequence of operations $\mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0} \in \mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{P})^{\otimes k}$ was performed at the previous time steps. We have

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}|k+1:k}^{\mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0}}(\cdot) = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}^{k+1:0}(\,\cdot\,, \mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0})\,. \tag{20}$$

If no system-environment correlations were present at t_k, the dynamics between t_k and t_{k+1} could be described by a linear channel $\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}|t_{k+1}:t_k}^{\mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0}}$ that maps input states at t_k to output states at t_{k+1}. It could be reconstructed by measuring the output states $\eta_S^{(j|t_{k+1})}(\mathcal{Q}^{(i)}, \mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0}) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}|k+1:k}^{\mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0}}(\mathcal{Q}^{(j)})$ corresponding to a pure state basis $\{Q^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{d_S^2}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$. Note that the projective maps $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{d_S^2}$ corresponding to this basis lie in $\mathcal{P}$. Consequently, correlations are present at t_k, if there exists a sequence $\mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0}$ and a pure state Q', such that

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}|t_{k+1}:t_k}^{\mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0}}(Q') \neq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}|k+1:k}^{\mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0}}(\mathcal{Q}')\,, \tag{21}$$

	full	unitary	projective
$\mathcal{M}$	$d_{\mathcal{S}}^4$	$(d_{\mathcal{S}}^2-1)^2+1$	$\frac{1}{4}d_{\mathcal{S}}^2(d_{\mathcal{S}}+1)^2$
$\mathcal{T}$	$d_{\mathcal{S}}^{4N}$	$[(d_{\mathcal{S}}^2-1)^2+1]^N$	$[\frac{1}{4}d_{\mathcal{S}}^2(d_{\mathcal{S}}+1)^2]^N$

Table 1: *Scaling of the number of QSTs.* Number of output states that have to be reconstructed by QST in order to obtain a superchannel and an N-step process tensor for different sets of available operations, respectively.

i.e., the dynamics from t_k to t_{k+1} cannot be described by a channel. Note, that a similar witness for correlations has been introduced in Ref. [24]. Both $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}|k+1:k}^{\mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0}}$ as well as $\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}|t_{k+1}:t_k}^{\mathbf{Q}_{k-1:0}}$ can be directly derived from $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}^{N:0}$ without any further measurements. Obviously, if correlations can be detected in this way, the corresponding restricted correlation-memory matrix does not vanish. If, additionally to $\mathcal{P}$, the 'do-nothing' operation $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is available, these witnesses can also be constructed between arbitrary time-steps t_j and t_k (where $0 \leq j < k \leq N$).

4.3 Tomography of X-state dynamics

It is instructive to illustrate the concepts introduced in the previous sections with a low dimensional and computationally accessible example. For simplicity of notation, we firstly restrict the investigation to the superchannels $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}$ constructed from local unitary maps and projective maps, respectively.

The simplest conceivable open quantum system is the case of a qubit coupled to another qubit that serves as the environment. It is important to note that neither knowledge of the size of the environment, the total Hamiltonian H_{tot} nor the total initial state $\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}$ are necessary for the experimental reconstruction of a superchannel. Here, this knowledge is merely assumed in order to calculate it explicitly.

We choose the seven-dimensional family of X-states [40, 41] as a blueprint for initial total states $\rho^{\mathcal{SE}}$[4]. X-states are states of the form

$$\rho_X^{\mathcal{SE}} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & 0 & 0 & a_{14} \\ 0 & a_{22} & a_{23} & 0 \\ 0 & a_{23}^* & a_{33} & 0 \\ a_{14}^* & 0 & 0 & a_{44} \end{pmatrix} \tag{22}$$

in a given basis (in our case the eigenbasis of $\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z$). Eq. (22) describes a valid quantum state iff ρ_X has unit trace, $a_{22}a_{33} \geq |a_{23}|^2$ and $a_{11}a_{44} \geq |a_{14}|^2$. The family of X-states includes both entangled states and separable states, as well as product states. Hence, it is well-suited for the analysis of the detectability of correlations by means of local unitary operations. For our total Hamiltonian we choose

$$H_{\text{tot}} = \omega \left(\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x + \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y + \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z\right), \tag{23}$$

where $\omega \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. These choices of H_{tot} and $\rho_X^{\mathcal{SE}}$ allow for an analytical construction of the superchannel, but are also non-trivial enough to exhibit the features we would like to investigate, in particular the effects of initial system-environment correlations.

In order to reconstruct the full superchannel, it is necessary as a first step to compute the outcome states for a full basis of the space $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ of local preparations. Let $\{\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z\}$ be the Pauli matrices. A possible basis of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ is given by the set $\left\{P^{(i)} \otimes P^{(j)\mathrm{T}}\right\}$, where the pure states

$$\begin{aligned} P^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbb{1} + \sigma_z\right), \quad P^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbb{1} + \sigma_x\right), \\ P^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbb{1} - \sigma_x\right), \quad P^{(4)} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbb{1} + \sigma_x\right) \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

constitute a basis of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$. It is important to note that any other basis of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ (for example, the well-known tetrahedral qubit SIC-POVM [42]) would yield the same super channel. The corresponding output states $\eta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(jk)}$ are given by

$$\eta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(jk)} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{e^{-\mathrm{i}H_{\text{tot}}t}\left(P^{(jk)} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{E}}\right)\left[\rho_X^{\mathcal{SE}}\right]e^{\mathrm{i}H_{\text{tot}}t}\right\}, \tag{25}$$

[4] Generally, the initial total state before preparation is considered constant. Here, investigating a family of states merely allows us to analyze the set of detectable correlations.

where $P^{(jk)} = P^{(j)} \otimes P^{(k)\mathrm{T}}$ and the full superchannel $\mathcal{M}$ can be calculated as

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{j,k=1}^{4} \eta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(jk)} \otimes \Delta^{(j)\mathrm{T}} \otimes \Delta^{(k)\mathrm{T}}, \tag{26}$$

with $\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Delta^{(l)} P^{(m)}\right) = \delta_{lm}$.

Accordingly, in order to construct the restricted superchannel $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}$ based on the set of unitary preparations, it is first necessary to fix a basis in the space spanned by the unitary maps. Here, we choose the basis $\left\{\mathcal{Z}^{(\alpha)}\right\} = \left\{\mathcal{Z}^{(0)} = \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{Z}^{(j,\pm)}, \mathcal{Z}^{(j+k+1,+)}\right\}$ (with $j,k \in \{1,2,3\}$ and $j < k$), derived in App. C. However, in principle, any set of $(d_{\mathcal{S}}^2-1)^2+1 = 10$ linearly independent unitary operations would work. The output states corresponding to each of these unitary preparations are given by

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\alpha)} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{e^{-\mathrm{i}H_{\mathrm{tot}}t}\left(\mathcal{Z}^{(\alpha)} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{E}}\right)\left[\rho_X^{\mathcal{SE}}\right] e^{\mathrm{i}H_{\mathrm{tot}}t}\right\} \tag{27}$$

and the restricted superchannel $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}$ can be constructed as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{10} \zeta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(\alpha)} \otimes \mathcal{X}^{(\alpha)\mathrm{T}}, \tag{28}$$

where $\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathcal{X}^{(\alpha)}\mathcal{Z}^{(\beta)}\right) = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$. Analogously, we construct $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}$ by using the basis of the set of projective maps given in Eq. (53).

Given the superchannel $\mathcal{M}$, the correlation-memory matrix $\mathcal{K}$ can be directly derived; the restricted correlation-memory matrix $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}}$ can be obtained by constructing the superchannel $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{V}}$ for the uncorrelated initial state $\rho_X^{\mathrm{Prod.}} = \rho_X^{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \rho_X^{\mathcal{E}}$. $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}}$ is then given by $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}} - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{V}}$. The correlation-memory matrix $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{P}}$ for the restriction to projective operations is constructed in the same vein.

It turns out that, except for trivial total dynamics ($\omega t = n\frac{\pi}{2}$), the restricted correlation-memory matrices $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{P}}$ are equal to zero iff

$$a_{23} = a_{14} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad a_{22}a_{33} = a_{11}a_{44}. \tag{29}$$

We have $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}} \neq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and the total correlation-memory matrix $\mathcal{K}$ differs both from $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{P}}$; however, it is also equal to zero iff Eq. (29) is fulfilled. X-states that satisfy the relations in Eq. (29) are product states. Consequently, any correlations between the system and the environment could be detected with both $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{P}}$ (and hence with the unrestricted correlation-memory matrix $\mathcal{K}$). Note that the 'do nothing' correlation-memory matrix $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{S}}}$, *i.e.*, the correlation-memory matrix that can be constructed without performing any local operation, would be zero iff $\mathfrak{Im}\left(a_{23}\right) = 0$ (*i.e.*, $a_{23} \in \mathbb{R}$). Performing intermediate local operations substantially increases the set of detectable correlations.

In this example, unitary preparation and projections can reveal exactly the same kinds of initial correlations as the full set of local operations. This is not generally true. Consider, for example, a two-qubit state with correlation matrix $\chi^{\mathcal{SE}} = \alpha\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_x$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, and a total unitary evolution that is given by the swap operator S. The action of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}}$ on an arbitrary unitary map $\mathcal{Z}'$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}}\left(\mathcal{Z}'\right) &= \alpha\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{S\left(\mathcal{Z}'\left[\sigma_z\right] \otimes \sigma_x\right) S^{\dagger}\right\} \\ &= \alpha\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{\sigma_x \otimes \mathcal{Z}'\left[\sigma_z\right]\right\} = 0,\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

and hence $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}} = 0$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{K} \neq 0$. For example, if we consider the causal break $\mathcal{C} = |01\rangle\langle 01|$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}\left(\mathcal{C}\right) &= \alpha\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{S\left[|0\rangle\langle 0|\langle 1|\sigma_z|1\rangle \otimes \sigma_x\right] S^{\dagger}\right\} \\ &= -2\alpha\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left(\sigma_x \otimes P^{(1)}\right) = -2\alpha\sigma_x.\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

In this case, the fact that the correlations cannot be detected by unitary preparations alone, stems from a particular interplay between the total unitary evolution (the swap operation S) and the correlation matrix $\chi^{\mathcal{SE}}$.

4.4 Restricted process tensors and quantum control

An important field where a restricted set of performable local operations and the presence of non-Markovian effects come into play together is that of quantum control of open systems (see for example Ref. [20] for an introduction). Here, generally speaking, the goal is to steer the system of interest to a desired final state by means of local, time-dependent Hamiltonians, which can be controlled by the experimenter. For microscopic models that assume knowledge of the total system-environment Hamiltonian, the impact of

these local Hamiltonians on the dynamics of the system can often be readily deduced. However, if only local information, for example a master equation description, is at hand, it is in general unclear how to include the influence of a local operation into the description [43]. The process tensor approach is tailored to solve this problem operationally.

The presence of memory effects – *i.e.*, the non-Markovianity of the underlying process – is of particular importance for dynamical decoupling experiments [27], where the local Hamiltonians are employed in such a way that they average out the influence of the environment and, effectively, decouple a system from its environment. This is only possible if memory effects are present [43].

Under the assumption that the time span over which the local Hamiltonians act is small compared to typical time scales of the dynamics of the system (*i.e.* the Hamiltonians basically act at fixed times as 'kicks' of infinite strength [44]), such an experimental set-up can be described as a mapping from a set of unitary maps $\left\{\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}\right\}_{i=1}^{N-1}$, that act on the system at times t_i, to a final state $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}\left(\mathcal{Z}^{(1)},\cdots,\mathcal{Z}^{(N-1)}\right)$.

To demonstrate the applicability of the restricted process tensor framework to quantum control and dynamical decoupling, we show how it can be used to find an ideal decoupling sequence in the scenario where decoupling is required at a single fixed time t_N (as opposed to decoupling for all times). To this end, we say that a sequence of unitary maps decouples the system from its environment at the time t_N if $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}\left(\mathcal{Z}^{(1)},\cdots,\mathcal{Z}^{(N-1)}\right) = \mathcal{Z}\left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{init.}}\right]$ for all initial system states $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{init.}}$, where $\mathcal{Z}$ is a fixed unitary, and hence reversible, map.

In order for dynamical decoupling to be operationally meaningful, it has to be assumed that the initial total state is of product form (*i.e.*, $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}} = \rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{init.}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{\text{init.}}$), where the experimenter has control over the system state, and $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{\text{init.}}$ is independent of the choice of $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{init.}}$. The process tensor that describes the dynamics of the system is then a map from the controllable inputs (i.e. the initial system states and the unitary maps $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}$) to the final state $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}\left(\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{init.}},\mathbf{Z}_{N-1:1}\right)$. Its experimental reconstruction follows from Eq. (8) and is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}^{N:0} = \sum_{\vec{i},k} \zeta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(k,\vec{i})} \otimes \omega^{(k)\mathrm{T}} \otimes \Theta^{(\vec{i})\mathrm{T}}, \tag{32}$$

where $\left\{\rho^{(i)}\right\}_{i=1}^{d_{\mathcal{S}}^2}$ forms a basis of $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}\right)$, the maps $\left\{\omega^{(k)}\right\}$ are the duals of $\left\{\rho^{(i)}\right\}$,and $\zeta_{\mathcal{S}}^{(k,\vec{i})}$ is the final system state for a choice $\left\{\rho^{(k)},\mathcal{Z}^{(i_1)},\cdots,\mathcal{Z}^{(i_N)}\right\}$ of the initial system state and the $N-1$ local unitary operations. Given that the initial state is now an input of the process tensor, it is possible (see App. A) for any sequence of $N-1$ local unitary operations $\mathbf{Z}_{N-1:1} = \left\{\mathcal{Z}^{(1)},\cdots,\mathcal{Z}^{(N-1)}\right\}$ to construct the map $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{Z}} : \mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}\right) \to \mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}\right)$, which depends on $\mathbf{Z}_{N-1:1}$ and maps initial states to final states:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{Z}}\left(\cdot\right) = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}^{N:0}\left(\cdot,\mathbf{Z}_{N-1:1}\right). \tag{33}$$

This means that the contraction of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}^{N:0}$ with a given sequence $\mathbf{Z}_{N-1:1}$ of unitary operations yields a map $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{Z}}$ that describes the dynamics on the level of the system of interest if the intermediate operations $\mathbf{Z}_{N-1:1}$ were performed[5]. We therefore call a sequence $\mathbf{Z}_{N-1:1}$ decoupling if $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{Z}}$ is a unitary map. Given the restricted process tensor of a process, it is then merely a numerical sampling problem to find such a sequence (if it exists for the chosen time steps). To illustrate the description of dynamical decoupling in terms of a process tensor, we reiterate the shallow pocket model discussed in Ref. [43].

Let $H_{\text{tot}} = \frac{g}{2}\sigma_z \otimes \hat{x}$ be the total, time-independent Hamiltonian for a qubit coupled to a particle on a line. We choose $\rho_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ as the initial states, where $\langle x|\Psi\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{\pi}}\frac{1}{x+\mathrm{i}\gamma}$ ($\gamma > 0$). The free evolution of the system-state, *i.e.* the evolution without intermediate local operations, is given by [43]

$$\rho_{\mathcal{S}}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{00}(0) & \rho_{01}(0)e^{-g\gamma t} \\ \rho_{01}^*(0)e^{-g\gamma t} & \rho_{11}(0) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{34}$$

which constitutes a purely dephasing dynamics. A possible experimental decoupling procedure could consist of a choice of the initial system state $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}$, a free evolution of the total state according to H_{tot} for a time Δt, a local unitary operation $\mathcal{Z}'$,

[5] In the language of Ref. [14], we are contracting a quantum comb with another quantum comb to yield a channel.

and, finally, a tomography of the system state after another free evolution for a time Δt. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}^{2:0}$ be the restricted process tensor for this experiment. We have

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}^{2:0}\left(\rho_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{Z}'\right) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{\mathcal{U}\left[\left(\mathcal{Z}' \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{E}}\right)\left[\mathcal{U}\left(\rho_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|\right)\right]\right]\right\}, \tag{35}$$

where $\mathcal{U}\left[\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}\right] = e^{-\mathrm{i}H_{\mathrm{tot}}\Delta t}\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}e^{\mathrm{i}H_{\mathrm{tot}}\Delta t}$. If we choose $|+\rangle\langle+|$ (where $|+\rangle = \left(|0\rangle + |1\rangle\right)/\sqrt{2}$) as the initial system state, it is straightforward to derive that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}}^{|+\rangle\langle+|} \neq \mathbf{0}$, and hence the process is non-Markovian. The non-Markovianity of the process could also have been detected with projective operations, as $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{P}}^{|+\rangle\langle+|}$ does not vanish either. Note that there are initial system states that would not allow for the detection of the non-Markovianity of the process, *e.g.*, $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{V}}^{|0\rangle\langle0|} = \mathbf{0}$.

Furthermore, setting $Z^{(a,b)} = a\sigma_x + b\sigma_y$ and $\mathcal{Z}^{(a,b)}\left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}\right] = Z^{(a,b)}\rho_{\mathcal{S}}Z^{(a,b)\dagger}$, where $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}}^{2:0}\left(\cdot, \mathcal{Z}^{(a,b)}\right) = \mathcal{Z}^{(a,b)*}\left(\cdot\right), \tag{36}$$

with $\mathcal{Z}^{(a,b)*}\left(\rho_{\mathcal{S}}\right) = Z^{(a,b)\dagger}\rho_{\mathcal{S}}Z^{(a,b)}$. Consequently, any local operation of the form $\mathcal{Z}^{(a,b)}$ decouples the system of interest from its environment for the given process. This can also be shown directly from the total Hamiltonian H_{tot} [43]. However, the restricted process tensor can be reconstructed based on local operations alone and allows for a numerical search of a sequence $\mathbf{Z}_{N-1:1}$ of unitary operations, such that $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{Z}}$ is a unitary map.

Note that the description of the dynamics in terms of a master equation would fail to reproduce these results (as shown in Ref. [43]). It is straightforward to derive the master equation of the free open evolution of the system:

$$\dot{\rho}_{\mathcal{S}} = L\left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}\right] = -g\frac{\gamma}{4}\left[\sigma_z, \left[\sigma_z, \rho_{\mathcal{S}}\right]\right] \tag{37}$$

$\forall \rho_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}\right)$, where L is the Lindbladian of the time evolution. The dynamics in Eq. (34) is then given by $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}\left(t\right) = e^{Lt}\left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}(0)\right]$, and, naively, the dynamics including the intermediate local operation $\mathcal{Z}^{(a,b)}$ would be described by $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{L}\left(2\Delta t\right) = \left(e^{L\Delta t}\mathcal{Z}^{(a,b)}e^{L\Delta t}\right)\left[\rho_{\mathcal{S}}(0)\right]$. Given that $e^{L\Delta t}$ is a purely dephasing channel, we conclude that $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}^{L}\left(2\Delta t\right)$ is generally not equal up to unitary transformation to the initial system state $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}(0)$. As soon as the dynamics are non-Markovian, master equations fail to capture the influence that local operations at intermediate time steps have on the dynamics of the system of interest.

5 Conclusion and Outlook

General open quantum system dynamics can be unambiguously described and characterized experimentally if the experimenter has unlimited control, *i.e.*, access to a basis of the space of possible operations on the system of interest. In this paper, we have investigated the more realistic situation, where the set of accessible operations is restricted by the experimental set-up. For these restricted cases, it is still possible to reconstruct a process tensor, as long as the dimension of the space that is spanned by the available operations is known. The obtained process tensor can then be meaningfully applied to any preparation that lies in this space and hence provides an operationally complete dynamical description of the given experimental set-up. If the set of available manipulations coincides with the set of unitary maps, the reconstructed process-tensor can, *e.g.*, be applied to any sequence of unital operations.

If one further local operation, a swap with an identically prepared system, is performable, or if the span of the set of performable operations contains operations that decouple the system from its environment, it is possible to construct operationally well-defined witnesses for initial system-environment correlations and the non-Markovianity of a process. We have demonstrated the applicability of these witnesses for two extremal cases: the set of unitary operations, where no information about the system can be inferred from the operation, and the set of projective measurements, where information about the system is obtained, but it collapses to a pure state in the process. In both cases, the witnesses reconstructed detected initial correlations, as well as the non-Markovianity of the underlying process. The quality of these witnesses, *i.e.*, their ability to detect correlations, depends crucially on the dimension of the space that is spanned by the available local operations and the interplay between correlations and the total unitary dynamics. However, we conjecture that for any reasonable scenario, *i.e.* a general total unitary dynamics and a set of performable local operations that is not 'too small', it is always possi-

ble to detect system-environment correlations by means of the experimentally realizable local operations. Total unitary dynamics that prevent correlations from local detection should be mere pathological examples. We defer a thorough numerical investigation of this statement to future works.

Restricted process tensors provide the ideal framework for the description of quantum control and dynamic decoupling. In order to simplify the calculations, we have demonstrated this for a time-independent total Hamiltonian. In practice, however, the restricted process tensor can be reconstructed experimentally for any conceivable total dynamics. Given the restricted process tensor, it is then simply a sampling problem to find the optimal sequence of operations that steers the system as close as possible to to a desired final state. The process tensor framework is also versatile enough to describe decoupling experiments and it allows to search for the sequence of local operations that comes closest to achieving decoupling at a fixed time t_N. While this is not the original aim of dynamical decoupling, it nonetheless provides a new perspective: if decoupling at selective points in time is sufficient, decoupling schemes based on restricted process tensors might prove more effective and less error-prone than traditional schemes that rely on the implementation of decoupling cycles much faster than typical correlation times [27].

Even if perfect decoupling will in general not be possible for randomly chosen time steps t_k, the process tensor approach is nonetheless fruitful: it opens up an avenue to benchmarking the deviation from perfect decoupling for a given choice of time steps and translates the question of whether perfect decoupling is possible to an inversion problem of the process tensor for the underlying process.

Acknowledgements.— We are grateful to F. Sakuldee for valuable conversations. SM is supported by the Monash Graduate Scholarship (MGS), Monash International Postgraduate Research Scholarship (MIPRS) and the J L William Scholarship.

A Action of a process tensor on $\mathbf{A}_{N-1:0}$

For simplicity of notation, we assume the Einstein summation convention in this section. Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{rr'r'';ss's''} |rr'r''\rangle \langle ss's''|$ be the superchannel of a one-step process. Its action on a completely positive map $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{ii';jj'} |ii'\rangle \langle jj'|$ is given by [7]:

$$\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{A}] = \mathcal{M}_{rr'r'';ss's''} \mathcal{A}_{r',r'',s',s''} |r\rangle \langle s| . \tag{38}$$

Note that the action of $\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathcal{A}$ is not given by a matrix multiplication. Eq. (38) can be readily generalized to the action of a process tensor. For example, for a two-step process we obtain that $\mathcal{T}^{2:0}[\mathbf{A}_{1:0}]$ is equal to

$$\mathcal{T}^{2:0}_{r_2x_1r_1x_0r_0;s_2y_1s_1y_0s_0} A^{(1:0)}_{x_1r_1x_0r_0;y_1s_1y_0s_0} |r_2\rangle \langle s_2| , \tag{39}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{1:0} = A^{(1:0)}_{x_1r_1x_0r_0;y_1s_1y_0s_0} |x_1r_1x_0r_0\rangle \langle y_1s_1y_0s_0|$ is an admissible sequence of two local operations and $\mathcal{T}^{2:0} = \mathcal{T}^{2:0}_{r_2x_1r_1x_0r_0;s_2y_1s_1y_0s_0} |r_2x_1r_1x_0r_0\rangle \langle s_2y_1s_1y_0s_0|$ is the process tensor for the process. Using Eq. (38) and the general form of Eq. (39), it can be readily shown that Eqs. (2) and (4) yield the correct superchannel/process tensor, respectively. We show this for the superchannel case: Any completely positive map $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$ can be written as $\mathcal{A} = a_k D^{(k)}$, where $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\{D^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^{d_S^4}$ is a basis of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)$. Let $\{\Delta^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^{d_S^4}$ be the dual set to $\{D^{(k)}\}$. The action of $\mathcal{M}$ constructed according to Eq. (2) on a local operation $\mathcal{A}$ is then given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{A}] = \left(\eta^{(k)} \otimes \Delta^{(k)\mathrm{T}}\right)\left[a_l D^{(l)}\right] &= a_l \eta^{(k)}_{rs} \Delta^{(k)}_{s's'';r'r''} D^{(l)}_{r'r'';s's''} |r\rangle \langle s| \\ &= a_l \eta^{(k)}_{rs} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Delta^{(k)} D^{(l)}\right) |r\rangle \langle s| = a_k \eta^{(k)} = \rho_S(\mathcal{A}) . \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Any process tensor can be contracted with a set of local operations to yield another process tensor. For example, let $\mathcal{T}^{2:0}$ be a two-step process tensor. Contraction with a local operation $\mathcal{A}^{(0)}$ yields

$$\mathcal{T}^{2:1|\mathcal{A}^{(0)}}_{rr'r'';ss's''} = \mathcal{T}^{2:0}_{rr'r''x'x'';ss's''y'y''} \mathcal{A}^{(0)}_{x'x'';y'y''} \tag{41}$$

The contracted process tensor $\mathcal{T}^{2:1|\mathcal{A}^{(0)}}$ describes the dynamics of the underlying process, given that the local operation $\mathcal{A}^{(0)}$ was performed in the first time step. Consequently, $\mathcal{T}^{2:1|\mathcal{A}^{(0)}}$ can be applied to any local operation $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ that can be performed at the second time step:

$$\mathcal{T}^{2:1|\mathcal{A}^{(0)}}\left(\mathcal{A}^{(1)}\right) = \rho_{\mathcal{S}}\left(\mathcal{A}^{(0)}, \mathcal{A}^{(1)}\right). \tag{42}$$

For a more detailed discussion of the mathematical properties of the process tensor, see the appendices of Ref. [12].

B Derivation of intermediate restricted process tensors

Let the action of the set $\{\mathcal{A}^{(\mu)}\} \subset \mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})$ be an IC POVM on the system, i.e., $\mathcal{A}^{(\mu)}(\rho_{\mathcal{S}}) = E^{(\mu)}\rho_{\mathcal{S}}E^{(\mu)\dagger}$, where the corresponding positive operators $\{\Pi^{(\mu)} = E^{(\mu)\dagger}E^{(\mu)}\}$ satisfy $\sum_\mu \Pi^{(\mu)} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and every state $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}$ is uniquely determined by the probabilities $p_\mu = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{A}^{(\mu)}(\rho_{\mathcal{S}})] = \mathrm{Tr}(\Pi^{(\mu)}\rho_{\mathcal{S}})$. In order to derive $\mathcal{T}^{k:0}$ $(0 < k < N)$, the output states at t_k corresponding to a basis of input sequences $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}$ have to be determined. Let $\mathbf{A}'_{k-1:0} \in \mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{F})^{\otimes k}$ be a fixed sequence of operations. We obtain

$$\mathcal{T}^{N:0}_{\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathcal{I}^{\otimes(N-k-1)}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{A}^{(\mu)}, \mathbf{A}'_{k-1:0}\right) = p_\mu p' \eta^{(\mu)}, \tag{43}$$

where $\eta^{(\mu)}$ is a unit trace quantum state that depends on $\mathcal{A}^{(\mu)}$, $\mathbf{A}'_{k-1:0}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{\otimes(N-k-1)}_{\mathcal{S}}$; p' is the trace of the system state $\rho'_{\mathcal{S}} = p'\eta'_{\mathcal{S}}$ at the time t_k after the sequence of operations $\mathbf{A}'_{k-1:0}$ was performed and $p_\mu = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{A}^{(\mu)}(\eta'_{\mathcal{S}})]$. For fixed $\mathbf{A}'_{k-1:0}$, we have $\sum_\mu \mathrm{Tr}(p_\mu p'\eta^{(\mu)}) = p'$, as $\sum_\mu p_\mu = 1$. Consequently, all probabilities p_μ can be derived via

$$p_\mu = \frac{1}{p'}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathcal{T}^{N:0}_{\mathcal{F}}\left(\mathcal{I}^{\otimes(N-k-1)}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{A}^{(\mu)}, \mathbf{A}'_{k-1:0}\right)\right], \tag{44}$$

which unambiguously determines the state $\rho'_{\mathcal{S}}$ at the time step t_k after the sequence of operations $\mathbf{A}'_{k-1:0}$ was performed. Accordingly, we can deduce the output states at t_k corresponding to a basis of input sequences $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}$, which enables the construction of $\mathcal{T}^{k:0}_{\mathcal{F}}$. Note that the above construction also works if the sequence $\mathcal{I}^{\otimes(N-k-1)}_{\mathcal{S}}$ of 'do-nothing' operations at the time steps $\{t_{k+1}, \ldots, t_{N-1}\}$ is replaced by a fixed sequence of trace preserving CP maps. From $\mathcal{T}^{k:0}_{\mathcal{F}}$, we obtain $\mathcal{T}^{k:j}_{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot) = \mathcal{T}^{k:0}_{\mathcal{F}}(\,\cdot\,, \mathcal{I}^{\otimes j}_{\mathcal{S}})$, where $0 \leq j < k$.

C Basis of unitary maps acting on a qubit

Any unitary matrix $Z \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$ can be expressed in terms of Pauli matrices $\{\sigma_i\}$ (where $i = x, y, z$) in the following form:

$$Z_{(\alpha,\vec{a})} = \cos\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\mathbb{1} - \mathrm{i}\sin\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i\sigma_i, \tag{45}$$

where $|\vec{a}| = 1$. Hence, a generic unitary 1-qubit map is of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z}_{(\alpha,\vec{a})}[\rho] = &\cos^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\underbrace{\mathbb{1}\rho\,\mathbb{1}}_{(I)} + \sin^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i^2\underbrace{(\sigma_i\rho\,\sigma_i)}_{(II)} + \cos\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\sin\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i\underbrace{\mathrm{i}\,(\mathbb{1}\rho\,\sigma_i - \sigma_i\rho\,\mathbb{1})}_{(III)} \\ &+ \sin^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\sum_{i<k}^{3} a_i a_k\underbrace{(\sigma_i\rho\,\sigma_k + \sigma_k\rho\,\sigma_i)}_{(IV)}.\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The term (I) in Eq. (46) can be accounted for by choosing $Z^{(0)} = \mathbb{1}$. Following the analogous derivation for the case of projective maps in [24], we set

$$Z^{(j,\pm)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\mathbb{1} \pm \mathrm{i}\sigma_j \right). \tag{47}$$

With the six matrices given in Eq. (47) both (II) and (III) can be obtained:

$$\sigma_j \rho \sigma_j = 2 \left(\mathcal{Z}^{(j,+)} + \mathcal{Z}^{(j,-)} \right) [\rho] - \mathcal{Z}^{(0)} [\rho] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{i} \left(\mathbb{1} \rho \, \sigma_j - \sigma_j \rho \mathbb{1} \right) = 2 \left(\mathcal{Z}^{(j,-)} - \mathcal{Z}^{(j,+)} \right) [\rho]. \tag{48}$$

The three remaining terms (IV) can be obtained with the three additional unitary matrices

$$Z^{(j+k+1,+)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\mathbb{1} + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}} \sigma_j + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}} \sigma_k \right), \tag{49}$$

with $j < k$. We have

$$\sigma_j \rho \, \sigma_k + \sigma_k \rho \, \sigma_j = 2 \left\{ 2 \, \mathcal{Z}^{(j+k+1,+)} - \left(1 + \sqrt{2} \right) \left(\mathcal{Z}^{(j,+)} + \mathcal{Z}^{(k,+)} \right) - \left(1 - \sqrt{2} \right) \left(\mathcal{Z}^{(j,-)} + \mathcal{Z}^{(k,-)} \right) \right\} [\rho].$$

Hence, any unitary map $\mathcal{Z}[\rho] = Z \rho \, Z^\dagger$ acting on a qubit can be represented as a linear combination of the ten unitary maps $\left\{ \mathcal{Z}^{(0)}, \mathcal{Z}^{(j,\pm)}, \mathcal{Z}^{(j+k+1,+)} \right\}$. A superchannel constructed based on this set of operations can meaningfully be applied to any completely positive map that lies in its linear span, which, in this case, is the set of all one-qubit unital maps.

D Set of projective maps

A rank-1 projective map $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{P}$ acting on a $d_\mathcal{S}$-dimensional state $\rho_\mathcal{S}$ can be written as:

$$\mathcal{Q}(\rho_\mathcal{S}) = Q \rho_\mathcal{S} Q, \tag{50}$$

where $Q = \sum_{k,l=1}^{d_\mathcal{S}} c_k c_l^* \, |k\rangle \langle l|$ is a ($d_\mathcal{S}$-dimensional) pure state and * denotes complex conjugation. The map $\mathcal{Q}$ has the form $Q \otimes Q^\mathrm{T}$. Any map $\mathcal{N} \in \mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{P})$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{N} = \sum_\nu b_\nu Q^{(\nu)} \otimes Q^{(\nu)\mathrm{T}} = \sum_\nu b_\nu \sum_{\substack{k,l=1 \\ k',l'=1}}^{d_\mathcal{S}} c_k^{(\nu)} c_l^{(\nu)*} c_{k'}^{(\nu)*} c_{l'}^{(\nu)} \, |kk'\rangle \langle ll'| \, . \tag{51}$$

The elements of any operator $\mathcal{N} \in \mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{P})$ with respect to the basis $|kk'\rangle \langle ll'|$ possess the following properties:

$$(1) \; \mathcal{N}_{kk';ll'} = \mathcal{N}_{l'l;k'k}, \qquad (2) \; \mathcal{N}_{kk';ll'} = \mathcal{N}_{kl;k'l'}, \qquad (3) \; \mathcal{N}^*_{kk';ll'} = \mathcal{N}_{k'k;l'l}. \tag{52}$$

By counting the number of remaining independent entries in the matrix $\mathcal{N}$, one can deduce that the vector space of matrices with the properties Eq. (52) is $\frac{1}{4} d_\mathcal{S}^2 \left(d_\mathcal{S} + 1 \right)^2$-dimensional. In principle, it remains to be shown whether $\mathrm{Span}(\mathcal{P})$ actually coincides with this vector space (the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ given in Eq. (51) could in principle have further symmetries than the ones stated in Eq. (52)). However, for the qubit case, a set of $\frac{1}{4} d_\mathcal{S}^2 \left(d_\mathcal{S} + 1 \right)^2 = 9$ pure states $Q^{(i)}$ that yields linearly independent projective maps has been constructed in Ref. [24]:

$$Q^{(j,\pm)} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{1} \pm \sigma_j) \quad \text{and} \quad Q^{(k+l+1,+)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{1} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sigma_k + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sigma_l \right), \tag{53}$$

where $k < l$ and $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3\} \equiv \{\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z\}$. For other low-dimensional cases, it is possible to numerically find $\frac{1}{4} d_\mathcal{S}^2 \left(d_\mathcal{S} + 1 \right)^2$ linearly independent projective maps. We leave the general statement regarding the dimension as a conjecture. The restricted process tensor for an N-step process can then be constructed by determining the output states for all $[\frac{1}{4} d_\mathcal{S}^2 \left(d_\mathcal{S} + 1 \right)^2]^N$ possible combinations of basis projections performed at the time steps $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^{N-1}$.

E Detection of correlations ⇒ non-Markovian dynamics

Here we prove that if correlations are detectable by means of local operations, the underlying process is non-Markovian.

Let $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}(\mathbf{A}_{N-2:0}) \equiv \rho_{\mathcal{SE}} = \rho_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}} + \chi_{\mathcal{SE}}$ denote the total density matrix at the time step t_{N-1} and $\mathcal{U}$ the total unitary dynamics from t_{N-1} to the final step t_N. If the correlations present in $\rho_{\mathcal{SE}}$ are detectable by a local operation $\mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{E}}\right)\left[\chi^{\mathcal{SE}}\right]\right\} \neq \mathbf{0}. \tag{54}$$

Note that this is true independent of the witness that was used to detect the correlations. Let $\left\{\Pi^{(\mu)}\right\}_{\mu=1}^{2d_{\mathcal{S}}^2-d_{\mathcal{S}}}$ be a set of projectors on the pure states $\{|k\rangle\}$, $\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|k\rangle+|l\rangle\right)\right\}$, $\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|k\rangle+i\,|l\rangle\right)\right\}$, $\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|k\rangle-|l\rangle\right)\right\}$ and $\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|k\rangle-i\,|l\rangle\right)\right\}$, where k and l run from 1 to $d_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $k<l$ is implied, and let $\left\{P^{(m)}\right\}_{m=1}^{d_{\mathcal{S}}^2}$ be a set of density matrices that constitutes a basis of $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}\right)$. The set $\left\{\Pi^{(\mu)}\right\}$ forms an overcomplete basis of $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}\right)$ with the appealing property that $\sum_{\mu=1}^{2d_{\mathcal{S}}^2-d_{\mathcal{S}}}\Pi^{(\mu)} = (2d_{\mathcal{S}}-1)\,\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}$, where $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the $d_{\mathcal{S}}\times d_{\mathcal{S}}$ identity matrix. Every local operation $\mathcal{A}=\sum_{m,\mu}\alpha^{(m\mu)}P^{(m)}\otimes\Pi^{(\mu)\mathrm{T}}$ can be written as a linear combination of causal breaks and hence $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{E}}\right)\left[\chi^{\mathcal{SE}}\right]\right\}$ is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m,\mu}\alpha^{(m\mu)}\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{\mathcal{U}\left(P^{(m)}\otimes\Pi^{(\mu)\mathrm{T}}\otimes\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{E}}\right)\left[\chi^{\mathcal{SE}}\right]\right\} &= \sum_{m,\mu}\alpha^{(m\mu)}\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{\mathcal{U}\left[P^{(m)}\otimes\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}\left(\Pi^{(\mu)}\chi_{\mathcal{SE}}\right)\right]\right\}\\ &\equiv \sum_{m,\mu}\alpha^{(m\mu)}\sigma^{(m\mu)} \neq \mathbf{0}.\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Consequently, there is at least one pair (m_0,μ_0), for which $\sigma^{(m_0\mu_0)}\neq\mathbf{0}$.

In what follows, we set $P^{(m_0)}\equiv P$ and $\sigma^{(m_0\mu)}\equiv\sigma^{(\mu)}$ and show that there exist two different causal breaks $P\otimes\Pi^{(\nu)\mathrm{T}}$ and $P\otimes\Pi^{(\xi)\mathrm{T}}$, such that the final reduced state after these causal breaks are applied differ, *i.e.*,

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\{\mathcal{U}[P\otimes\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}(\Pi^{(\nu)}\rho_{\mathcal{SE}})]\} \not\propto \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\{\mathcal{U}[P\otimes\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}(\Pi^{(\xi)}\rho_{\mathcal{SE}})]\}, \tag{56}$$

which means that the process is non-Markovian. By setting

$$p^{(\nu)}\eta \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{\mathcal{U}\left[P\otimes\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}\left(\Pi^{(\nu)}(\rho_{\mathcal{S}}\otimes\rho_{\mathcal{E}})\right)\right]\right\}, \tag{57}$$

where $p^{(\nu)}=\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi^{(\nu)}\rho_{\mathcal{S}}]$ is the probability to measure $\Pi^{(\nu)}$ given the total state $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}\otimes\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$, Eq. (56) can be rewritten as

$$p^{(\nu)}\eta+\sigma^{(\nu)} \not\propto p^{(\xi)}\eta+\sigma^{(\xi)}. \tag{58}$$

The process is only Markovian if the left and right sides of Eq. (58) are proportional for all pairs $\{\nu,\xi\}$. We note that $\mathrm{Tr}(\eta)=1$, while, due to the fact that $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}(\chi_{\mathcal{SE}})=\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}(\chi_{\mathcal{SE}})=\mathbf{0}$, it is straightforward to show that for all projections $\Pi^{(\mu)}$ we have $\mathrm{Tr}\left(\sigma^{(\mu)}\right)=0$. Consequently, proportionality in Eq. (58) would only hold if $\sigma^{(\nu)}=p^{(\nu)}/p^{(\xi)}\cdot\sigma^{(\xi)}$. We choose $\Pi^{(\xi)}$ such that $p^{(\xi)}\neq 0$ (this is always possible). If $p^{(\nu)}=0$, the two sides of Eq. (58) are not proportional and the process is non-Markovian. Otherwise, the ratio $p^{(\nu)}/p^{(\xi)}$ has to be positive. Given that there is at least one $\sigma^{(\mu_0)}\neq\mathbf{0}$, it is possible to find a projection $\Pi^{(\nu)}$ such that Eq. (58) holds, *i.e.*, it is possible to find a projection $\Pi^{(\nu)}$ such that $\sigma^{(\nu)}\not\propto\sigma^{(\xi)}$ or $\sigma^{(\nu)}=\lambda\sigma^{(\xi)}$ with $\lambda<0$. We assume the opposite and show that it leads to a contradiction.

Let all $\sigma^{(\mu)}$ be proportional to each other, *i.e.* $\sigma^{(\mu)}=\beta_\mu\sigma$ for all μ, where $\sigma\neq\mathbf{0}$ is some traceless matrix and $\beta_\mu>0$. If this holds, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mu=1}^{2d_{\mathcal{S}}^2-d_{\mathcal{S}}}\sigma^{(\mu)} = \sum_{\mu=1}^{2d_{\mathcal{S}}^2-d_{\mathcal{S}}}\beta_\mu\,\sigma = \sum_{\mu=1}^{2d_{\mathcal{S}}^2-d_{\mathcal{S}}}\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\{\mathcal{U}[P\otimes\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}(\Pi^{(\mu)}\chi_{\mathcal{SE}})]\}\\ = (2d_{\mathcal{S}}-1)\,\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}\left\{\mathcal{U}\left[P\otimes\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{S}}\left(\chi_{\mathcal{SE}}\right)\right]\right\}=\mathbf{0},\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

which implies that $\sum_{\mu}^{2d_S^2-d_S}\beta_\mu = 0$. Therefore, given that at least one of the factors β_μ has to differ from zero, there exist indices μ_1, μ_2 such that $\beta_{\mu_1} > 0$ and $\beta_{\mu_2} < 0$ and $\sigma^{(\mu_1)} = \beta_{\mu_1}/\beta_{\mu_2} \cdot \sigma^{(\mu_2)} \equiv \lambda\sigma^{(\mu_2)}$ with $\lambda < 0$, which concludes the proof.

References

[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[2] I. L. Chuang and M. A. Nielsen, J. Mod. Opt. **44**, 2455 (1997).

[3] G. Parravicini and A. Zecca, Rep. Math. Phys. **12**, 423 (1977).

[4] H. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002).

[5] K. Modi and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052119 (2010).

[6] K. Modi, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **18**, 253 (2011).

[7] K. Modi, Sci. Rep. **2**, 581 (2012).

[8] F. Buscemi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140502 (2014).

[9] G. Argentieri, F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, and M. Pezzutto, EPL **107**, 50007 (2014).

[10] F. Masillo, G. Scolarici, and L. Solombrino, J. Math. Phys. **52**, 012101 (2011).

[11] S. Vinjanampathy and K. Modi, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 052310 (2015).

[12] F. A. Pollock, C. Rodríguez-Rosario, T. Frauenheim, M. Paternostro, and K. Modi, arXiv:1512.00589 (2015).

[13] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Europhys. Lett. **83**, 30004 (2008).

[14] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 060401 (2008).

[15] F. Costa and S. Shrapnel, New J. Phys. **18**, 063032 (2016).

[16] O. Oreshkov and C. Giarmatzi, New J. Phys. **18**, 093020 (2016).

[17] C. Portmann, C. Matt, U. Maurer, R. Renner, and B. Tackmann, arXiv:1512.02240 (2015).

[18] L. Hardy, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A **370**, 3385 (2012).

[19] L. Hardy, arXiv:1608.06940 (2016).

[20] C. Altafini and F. Ticozzi, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control **57**, 1898 (2012).

[21] M. Shapiro and P. Brumer, *Principles of the Quantum Control of Molecular Processes* (John Wiley & Sons, 2003).

[22] M. S. Blok, C. Bonato, M. L. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, V. V. Dobrovitski, and R. Hanson, Nature Phys. **10**, 189 (2014).

[23] M. Reck, A. Zeilinger, H. J. Bernstein, and P. Bertani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 58 (1994).

[24] A.-m. Kuah, K. Modi, C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 042113 (2007).

[25] M. Ziman, M. Plesch, and V. Buzek, arXiv:quant-ph/0406088 (2004).

[26] M. Ziman, M. Plesch, and V. Bužek, Eur. Phys. J. D **32**, 215 (2005).

[27] L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2417 (1999).

[28] J. F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 390 (1997).

[29] E. C. G. Sudarshan, P. M. Mathews, and J. Rau, Phys. Rev. **121**, 920 (1961).

[30] K. Modi, C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 064102 (2012).

[31] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[32] M. Ringbauer, C. Wood, K. Modi, A. Gilchrist, A. White, and A. Fedrizzi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 090402 (2015).

[33] Á. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050403 (2010).

[34] Á. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Rep. Prog. Phys. **77**, 094001 (2014).

[35] H.-P. Breuer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210401 (2009).

[36] C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, K. Modi, L. Mazzola, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, Europhys. Lett. **99**, 20010 (2012).

[37] L. Mazzola, C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, K. Modi, and M. Paternostro, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 010102 (2012).

[38] E. Poon, Linear Algebra Appl. **468**, 122 (2015).

[39] C. B. Mendl and M. M. Wolf, Commun. Math. Phys. **289**, 1057 (2009).

[40] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Quantum Info. Comput. **7**, 459 (2007).

[41] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, and G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042105 (2010).

[42] J. M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A. J. Scott, and C. M. Caves, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 2171 (2004).

[43] C. Arenz, R. Hillier, M. Fraas, and D. Burgarth, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022102 (2015).

[44] L. Viola and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 2733 (1998).